DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 017 CS 508 474

AUTHOR Clyde, Glenda; And Others
TITLE Assessing Oral Competence: A Pilot at Northeast Missouri State University.
PUB DATE 19 Nov 93
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (79th, Miami Beach, FL, November 18-21, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Introductory Courses; Pilot Projects; Program Evaluation; *Speech Communication; *Student Evaluation; Videotape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS *Northeast Missouri State University; Student Centered Assessment

ABSTRACT

Responding to calls by Missouri's Coordinating Board of Higher Education and in turn by Northeast Missouri State University, the communication faculty appointed a committee on oral communication assessment. The committee submitted to the communication faculty an assessment proposal that focused on answering the question of whether the basic speech course was achieving its desired outcome. A pilot program of videotaping student speeches in some basic speech courses was approved. A literature review conducted by the committee suggested no significant increase in negative speaker responses or anxiety levels due to videotaping. Six faculty members volunteered to participate in the pilot program, representing 12 sections and 264 students. Students (10%) were videotaped, but only eight tapes were actually provided by the students to be analyzed, and one tape was disqualified because the instructor appeared briefly on the videotape. Seven students were rated as satisfactory, one student was rated as excellent. Despite being scaled back and encountering some problems, the pilot program was considered successful. The committee offered suggestions to facilitate adoption of the oral competence assessment proposal. To date, the proposal and recommendations remain officially tabled while pressures for oral communication assessment continues to mount. Some faculty members are taking a proactive stance by revising and using the procedures outlined in the proposal. (Twenty-one notes are included; a speech performance evaluation form, the pilot participation questionnaire, and an appendix of data are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 367 017

Assessing Oral Competence:

A Pilot at Northeast Missouri State University

submitted by

Dr. Glenda Clyde,
Dr. Barry Poyner,
Dr. Linnea Ratcliff

Northeast Missouri State University

Speech Communication Association National Convention
19 November 1993
Miami, Florida

CS508474

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Clyde

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As more communication departments consider assessing oral communication, the history of assessment efforts provides valuable design models. In most cases, the consideration of assessment is not optional, but rather is mandated by regional and national accrediting agenices, state legislatures, state boards, and university administrations.

Responding to calls by Missouri's Coordinating Board of Higher Education and in turn by Northeast Missouri State University, the communication faculty appointed a committee on oral communication assessment. This paper embodies the final report of that Committee on Oral Communication Assessment and will recount the history leading to the formation of the committee, review the literature on oral communication assessment and videotaping effects, describe the pilot methodology, summarize the pilot outcomes, report committee recommendations, and draw implications.

History Leading to Committee Formation

On 5 November 1991 the communication faculty of Northeast formed a committee on assessment. The committee was to consider assessment of oral communication and possibly refine ideas concerning videotaping students enrolled in the required basic speech course. Providing impetus for the committee's deliberations, Northeast established the following objectives for 1991-92: "utilize portfolio assessment for evaluation of the liberal arts and sciences core curriculum...design and implement an assessment program to recognize and measure effective oral communications similar to the writing assessment program currently in place."[1] The document had obvious

---

1 "1991-92 Annual Plan, Northeast Missouri State University" 4. The document was approved by the Board of Governors on 14 Sept. 1991.

implications for the assessment committee since the basic speech course constitutes part of the liberal arts core and since specifically "oral communication" had been mentioned.

Delighted that the university had concurred with what the communication faculty had already been exploring formally and informally that fall, the assessment committee agreed to the following tasks: 1) to review the literature on oral communication assessment and communication across the curriculum, 2) glean from the literature those ideas and assessment instruments applicable to communication at Northeast, 3) draft an assessment proposal, 4) report our proposal to the communication faculty, 5) submit copies of our report to appropriate agencies, and 6) consider the possible submission of a grant proposal.[2]

During the spring of 1992 the committee submitted to the communication faculty an assessment proposal. The proposal focused on answering, "Is the basic speech course achieving its desired outcomes?" The proposal considered assessment at two levels: assessment of each student enrolled in the course and assessment of the multi-sectional course as a whole. Both levels of assessment are predicated on videotaping each student enrolled in the basic course as he/she delivers a final speech in the second half of the semester.

At the individual student level, the objective is to make oral communication a part of the student's portfolio assessment: the videotaped speech would provide each student with a sample of his/her oral communication skill for inclusion in the portfolio. The required basic speech course would guarantee each student at least one such sample. In turn, as all disciplines become interested in obtaining samples of communication at advanced levels of studies to be included in the portfolio, communication faculty will be challenged to develop programs and initiatives for speaking across the curriculum.

---

2 Committee Memo Regarding Meetings and Agenda, from Barry Cole Poyner, 5 Nov. 1991.

Course evaluation is accomplished through sampling. Each semester a sample of videotaped speeches will be drawn from among all students, typically over 600, enrolled in the course. Each of the speeches in the sample will be viewed and rated by all faculty teaching the basic course. When all speeches within the sample have been rated and all ratings averaged, faculty will be able to generalize how well the desired outcomes are being achieved across all sections of the course. In addition, each faculty member will be able to compare his/her students' performances with those of others.

The Faculty Minutes of 25 February 1992 meeting detail approval of the pilot to be implemented in the fall of 1992 contingent on institutional support:

> Barry reported on speaking assessment. He said a pilot program could be put in place in Fall 1992 which would have instructors videotape their students' latter (their third or fourth speech during the semester) speeches. Students would purchase videotapes. Students' identity would not be traced to a particular speech class/instructor. From out of a total of about 600 videotapes a sample would be drawn, and all comm. faculty could get together and assess tapes to enable a holistic analysis of speeches/course.[3]

Receiving faculty support, the committee made a special budgetary request of the Academic Vice-President's Office and was successful in securing two video cameras for the pilot.

In June the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education adopted a task force report which established the goal of producing "highly qualified graduates" as measured by "performance on assessments of general education, including measures of oral and

---

3 Communication Faculty Minutes, 25 Feb. 1992.

written communication skills and critical thinking."[4] While this report added impetus to the task of assessing oral communication, on 8 September 1992 some faculty expressed reservations about implementing the pilot as agreed to the previous semester. Therefore, the pilot, originally designed to include every basic speech section, was scaled back to accomodate those who chose not to participate.[5] The assessment pilot was limited to the fall semester and would be reviewed by the communication faculty to determine its value and future usefulness.

Literature Review

Oral Communication Assessment

In order to review current assessment of oral communication, the committee contacted the Speech Communication Association National Office, attended sessions devoted to assessment at professional conferences, and researched communication journals. One "guiding" document for the committee was a 1990 publication of the Committee on Assessment and Testing of the Speech Communication Association.[6] Elucidating nine principles, the document underscored that assessment should be based on goals established by the faculty, should consider multi-dimensional measures (knowledge, skills, and attitudes), should recognize the "demands of constituencies involved" which included communication across the curriculum, should be based on multiple methods, and should use instruments and procedures externally validated.

---

4 "Suggested Statewide Public Policy Initiatives and Goals: Report to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education" 8. The report was adopted 5 June 1992.

5 Communication Faculty Minutes, 8 Sept. 1992. The committee had concluded that videotaping was an acceptable method. Some faculty voiced reservations concerning videotaping, so the committee undertook a literature review of videotaping effects.

6 Denver Conference Program Assessment Group, "Principles of Speech Communication Program Assessment," 1990 Denver Assessment Conference.

Particularly valuable to the proposal was "principle five" which acknowledged portfolio samples as a method of assessment.

James W. Chesebro offered the most comprehensive examination of assessment efforts in communication.[7] Observing three general approaches to assessment--performance oriented, cognitively oriented, and affectively oriented--Chesebro emphasized that the approach must match the individual program. Performance oriented assessment has focused on mastering pyschomotor skills in communication, with emphasis usually on speaking, but also on listening. Chesebro suggested that Rubin's Communication Competency Assessment Instrument (CCAI) be considered but regarded the instrument, while reliable, as "personnel, time, and cost intensive." Cognitive proponents have advocated that competence and effectiveness be viewed separately. One test, Basic Communication Fidelilty (BCF), has shown some promise with its emphasis on communication process, but the instrument is still in its infancy. An alternative measure might be a battery of standardized questions focusing on theory and process. Finally, a third approach has focused on measuring affect: either the fear of speakers or the "bond" felt by receivers. McCroskey's Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) has been commonly used.

Chesebro points out that:

> The creation of an institution-wide oral communication competency program requires that certain pragmatic decisions be made before the program is created. From an institutional perspective, the more pragmatic of these decisions includes an assessment of the available resources to fund the total cost of the program in terms of faculty salaries

---

7 James W. Chesebro, "Oral Communication Competency and Assessment as a Component of Institutional College and University Accreditation," n.d.

> and time, physical plant space requirements, and an evaluation of the kinds and costs of administrative overhead generated by such a program.[8]

Additionally, Chesebro suggests that administrators be supplied with a description detailing what students can and cannot do as oral communicators, criteria suggesting what students should be able to do after instruction, and standards that determine if specified outcomes have been achieved.

In considering what students can and cannot do, the SCA publication, "Communication is Life"[9] developed measurable speaking and listening objectives.[10] When measuring competencies, Quianthy recommends holistic evaluation as opposed to atomistic assessment.[11] Furthermore, when choosing an instrument, Quianthy advises that the instrument conform to SCA guidelines.

One such instrument, developed by the Committee on Assessment and Testing of SCA, is known as the "Competent Speaker Speech Performance Evalution Form." Divided into eight general categories, the form asks evaluators to rank speakers in terms of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent performance. Approved by the Educational

---

8 James W. Chesebro 5.

9 Richard L. Quianthy, Project Director, "Communication Is Life: Essential College Sophomore Speaking and Listening Competencies," SCA publication, 1990.

10 Basic Speech Course Committee Memo regarding COMM 170 Recommendations, 11 Oct. 1988. Five general objectives and the requirement of at least four graded presentations were established. Bearing on this issue would also be the following article: Jerry D. Feezel, "Toward a Confluent Taxonomy of Cognitive, Affective, and Psychomotor Abilities in Communication," Communication Education 34 (1985): 1-11.

11 More indepth analysis of instruments may be found in an article by Nancy Rost Goulden, "Theory and Vocabulary for Communication Assessments," Communication Education 41 (1992): 258-269. Goulden favors the term product/performance assessment to distinguish between creative behaviors and enactive behaviors: the dual elements of text and delivery.

Policies Board, the instrument is accompanied by a manual and is available in print form as of spring of 1993.[12]

Finally, numerous articles and convention papers on communication across the curriulum (CXC) were read.[13] However, the committee decided that until a program of communication assessment was adopted by the communication faculty, it would be premature to contemplate extensive university-wide involvement. Therefore, these documents were excluded from the review.

In summary, the review of the literature revealed three major approaches to communication assessment: psycho-motor, cognitive, and affective. Given our commission to investigate "oral" communication, the committee focused on psycho-motor measures. Since multiple measures were also encouraged, one should not construe that the committee was opposed to cognitive and affective measurement and that they should not be added later, but that the committee viewed psycho-motor measurement as the crucial first step in establishing a comprehensive communication assessment program at Northeast. Furthermore, the literature emphasized the need to adhere to

---

12 Sherwyn P. Morreale, Michael R. Moore, K. Phillip Taylor, Donna Surges-Tatum, and Ruth Hulbert-Johnson, editors, "'The Competent Speaker' Speech Evaluation Form," Speech Communication Association, 1993. See also Jean DeWitt, Mary Bozik, Ellen Hay, Judith Litterest, C. Sue Strohkirch, and Karolyn Yocum, "Oral Communication Competency and Teacher Certification in the U.S.: Reality and Recommendations," Communication Education 40 (1991): 144-151.

13 Michael W. Cronin and George L. Grice, "Implementing Oral Communication Across the Curriculum," Convention Paper, Central States Communication Association, Chicago, IL, 12 April 1991; Cronin and Grice, "Oral Communication Across the Curriculum: Designing, Implementing and Assessing a University-wide Program," Speech Communication Association Short Course, Chicago, IL, 1 November 1990; Michael Cronin and Phillip Glenn, "The Oral Communication Program: Program Description and Model Proposal for a Communication Across the Curriculum Emphasis," Convention Paper, Speech Communication Association, November 1990; Cronin and Grice, "Speech Communication Across the Curriculum: Development of the Radford University Oral Communication Program," Convention Paper, Southern States Communication Association, Tampa, FL, April 1991; Patricia R. Palmerton, "Speaking Across the Curriculum: Threat, Opportunity or Both?" Convention Paper, Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA, November 1988; Thomas M. Steinfatt, "Communication Across the Curriculum," Communication Quarterly 34 (1986): 460-470.

professional standards and to utilize instruments approved by the Speech Communication Association. Support was also found for portfolio sampling and holistic evaluation.

Videotaping Effects

The impact of videotaping on classroom speaking as a research topic reached its zenith in the late 1960s and early 70s. The literature reveals a number of universities (Purdue, Air Force Academy, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, Penn State, Wayne State, and Oakland University) involved in videotaping classroom speeches for research and/or pedagogical reasons. The number of research studies specifically focusing on anxiety and situational conditions created by videotaping is limited: no studies revealed increased anxiety or other negative situational conditions due to videotaping.

Bush, et. al. experimentally tested actual levels of anxiety resulting from performing in front of an audience with a videotape recorder present and found that "the presence of a VTR in a classroom speaking situation did not create any negative aspects of speaker response."[14] Similar conclusions were reached by those studying the impact of cameras in the courtroom on witness behavior.[15]

After reviewing various university programs, Nelson found anecdotal evidence of some students who seemed rather reticient and shy in class, but lost this apparent "stage fright" in front of the camera. "Sharing attention with the camera tended to make them

---

14 Janice D. Bush, John R. Bitner, and William D. Brooks, "The Effect of the Video-Tape Recorder on Levels of Anxiety, Exhibitionism, and Reticence," Speech Teacher 21 (1972): 129.

15 Bert Pryor, David U. Strawn, Raymond W. Buchanan, and Milan D. Meeske, "The Florida Experiment: An Analysis of On-the-Scene Responses to Cameras in the Courtroom," The Southern Speech Communication Journal 45 (1979): 12-26.

less concerned with themselves."[16] Bush reported that many students spent more time in preparation for videotaped speeches than the usual classroom speeches.[17]

Bradley found no significant improvement in the student's speaking ability through the use of video-recording, but he did find that its use improved the student's attitude toward certain aspects of the course.[18] Goldhaber and Kline followed this line of inquiry to find that in classes using videotaping 1) attendance was significantly higher, 2) students had significantly better attitudes toward the use of videotaping, and 3) students evaluated the instructor significantly higher than students from non-video classes.[19]

The purpose of videotaping student speeches in the Northeast assessment pilot was to obtain a realistic representation of each student's speaking skill. In this regard, observations by Ochs are of interest. Describing his experiences videotaping advanced public speaking, he observed that "Students seemed more comfortable and less distracted with the camera positioned behind the live studio audience rather than elsewhere. This enabled speakers to react to visual feedback from the audience."[20] He also found that by operating the camera, he could magnify or minimize strengths and weaknesses of non-verbal messages (i.e. hand gestures, distracting mannerisms, etc.).

In summary, these findings suggest no significant increase in negative speaker responses or anxiety levels due to videotaping. Attitudinal and situational benefits may result from videotaping in the classroom. Finally, minimizing camera technique and

---

16 Harold E. Nelson, "Instructional Uses of Videotape: A Symposium," Speech Teacher 17 (1968): 103.

17 Bush, et. al. 129.

18 Bert E. Bradley, "An Experimental Study of the Effectiveness of the Video-Recorder in Teaching a Basic Speech Class," Speech Teacher 19 (1970): 167.

19 Gerald M. Goldhaber and John A. Kline, "Effects of Videotape on Attendance and Attitude," Speech Teacher 21 (1972): 97.

20 Donovan J. Ochs, "Videotape in Teaching Advanced Public Speaking: A Symposium," Speech Teacher 17 (1968): 111.

standardizing the camera's position in the classroom may be necessary to assure the goals of the assessment pilot.

Method Summary

At the beginning of the 1992 fall semester a memo was sent to the communication faculty, reminding them of the pilot. Faculty were asked to submit their syllabi indicating dates and times of the speech assignment they wished taped. From the required four speeches, the third or fourth speech was suggested to better reflect the outcomes of the course. Also, faculty were asked to inform students of the videotaping, the need for each of them to supply a videotape at the appropriate time, and the opportunity for them to have a sample of their speaking skill to include in their portfolio.

Six faculty members volunteered to participate in the pilot representing 12 sections of the basic speech course with an enrollment of 264 students. A taping schedule was determined which spanned three weeks and totalled 66 hours of videotaping. Four work study personnel were recruited, trained (two sessions) to operate the camera and become familiar with general taping procedure. These workers taped five sections; the instructors of the other seven sections arranged for their own videotaping. Each student supplied his/her own tape and received it back immediately after the taping.

In late November a second memo was sent to faculty involved in the pilot informing them of the speech screening date, time, and place. Also, faculty were asked to encourage students to submit their individual tapes if called by the division office.

Upon request, Computer Services supplied a randomly drawn list of 30 (10%)[21] names from those students enrolled in the volunteered sections. This list and specific

---

21 At the time, the number of students involved approached 300. After this number had been set, one instructor withdrew a section from the pilot, consequently lowering the students involved from ca. 286 to ca. 264.

telephoning instructions were given to division office personnel who called students requesting that they submit their tapes for review. Students were assured that this request would in no way affect their class grade. Ten students promised to bring in their tapes: eight tapes actually were brought into the division office. Division personnel made sure that the tape label revealed only the name of the student and had no reference to section or instructor.

On 8 December 1992 four faculty members viewed eight videotaped speeches. One speech was eliminated because the identity of the instructor was revealed on the tape. Each faculty member rated each speech individually using SCA's "Competent Speaker Speech Performance Evaluation Form" (see Appendix A). The ratings for each speaker were averaged, and comments were noted. Also, each faculty member was asked to complete a questionnaire regarding the assessment pilot. These suggestions have been incorporated into the results section.

Results

Discussion of the results of the pilot will focus on its three phases: videotaping, random sample selection and screening, and the assessment process. The Oral Competence Assessment Proposal was based on 100% compliance among faculty teaching the basic course. When the pilot was changed to include only sections volunteered by instructors, the major variable of the proposal was not tested. Instead of 27 sections, 12 sections were videotaped.

According to the "Pilot Participant Questionnaire" (see Appendix B) administered to participating faculty, a few problems occurred during taping: some students forgot to bring tapes, and some tapes failed to record. This was remedied by the instructor providing a spare tape. In some instances the speaker started before the lead-in on the tape had run its course, cutting off part of the introduction.

The list of student names provided by Computer Services was not random in the scientific sense. The computer is programmed to select every "nth" name based on the total number of students and number in the sample. The sample size was arbitrarily set at 10%. This yielded 30 names from which 10 were drawn to form the screening pool.

There was some difficulty in securing students' videotapes. Students tend not to be home during the day which made contacting them difficult. Office personnel called some students three times. Ten students agreed to bring in their tapes--eight actually did. Also, although office personnel were calling from a list of 30 randomly drawn names, the final 10 who agreed to bring in their tapes may not have been evenly distributed among the names on the list. One instructor reported that three out of eight of the student speeches evaluated were from his/her classes. This may reflect a problem in calling procedure as described above, or it may reflect the fact that some instructors teach three or four sections of the basic speech course while others may teach only one or two sections. This would account for an uneven distribution among faculty of students in the screening pool. Another explanation might be the need for a larger sample.

Another difficulty was that the 10 students, whose speeches were selected, had not been told to cue up their tapes prior to bringing them to the division office. As a result, the reviewing faculty had to wait while this was done. One instructor expressed dislike for the evaluation form.

The SCA "Competent Speaker Speech Performance Evaluation Form" was the basis for the assessment of course outcomes. The pilot involved less than half of the sections of the course and used an unscientific sample; therefore, results could not be generalized to the entire basic course population. The summary which follows represents potential data collection and analysis.

The performance forms were first analyzed to determine an overall average rating for each speaker. Table 1.1 shows the rating for each speaker determined by averaging all eight competencies for all judges for each student. In the sample, six out of

seven students were rated as satisfactory. One student was rated as excellent. Satisfactory ratings ranged from 4.5 to 6.5.

SPEAKER ASSESSMENT

SPEAKERS	SPEAKING PERFORMANCE RATINGS		
	Unsatisfactory 1 - 3	Satisfactory 4 - 6	Excellent 7 - 9
# 1		4.5	
# 2		5.4	
# 3		5.7	
# 4		5.7	
# 5			7.2
# 6		6.5	
# 7		5.5	

Table 1.1 The overall performance rating for each speaker determined by averaging all competencies for all judges

Table 1.2 shows an overall average rating for each competency. Ratings for all students for all judges were averaged for each competency. In the sample, all speaking competencies measured by the SCA form averaged a satisfactory rating. Six of the eight competencies averaged 6 or better. Competency six was rated 4.9, and competency eight was rated 4.8.

COMPETENCIES ASSESSMENT

COMPETENCIES	SPEAKING PERFORMANCE RATINGS		
	Unsatisfactory 1 - 3	Satisfactory 4 - 6	Excellent 7 - 9
Competency One: Chooses/narrows topic appropriately		6.2	
Competency Two: Communicates specific purpose		6.3	
Competency Three: Provides appropriate support material		6.1	
Competency Four: Organizational pattern appropriate		6.0	
Competency Five: Uses language that is appropriate		6.3	
Competency Six: Uses vocal variety		4.9	
Competency Seven: Pronunciation, grammar, articulation		6.3	
Competency Eight: Physical behaviors support message		4.8	

Table 1.2 The rating of each competency determined by averaging all speakers for all judges

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Written, critical comments made by the faculty for each competency were logged. Comments were not written by all judges nor for all students. It was felt that they provided information and insight into the evaluation of each competency. A grid reflecting all ratings of each faculty member for each competency for each student is presented (see Appendix C) to compare ratings across faculty.

Recommendation

The committee members viewed the pilot, despite being scaled back and despite some problems, as having been successful. Consequently, they recommended and moved that the Oral Competence Assessment Proposal, having been partially tested in a pilot, be adopted by the communication faculty and fully implemented in the fall of 1993; further, in the interim, a new assessment committee should be appointed to resolve minor problems discovered through the pilot and to prepare for the fall implementation.

In addition, the following suggestions were offered to facilitate that outcome. These suggestions concerned: videotaping, random selection and screening, and assessment process. Concerning videotaping, the committee suggested that: 1) cameras be maintained for the exclusive use of basic course ssessment, 2) to the extent possible, arrangement of classes be structured in 1 1/2 hour or 3 hour meeting times to minimize equipment set up, 3) speakers be instructed to wait for a cue from the camera operator before beginning the speech, 4) cameras be located behind the audience and uniformly left alone once activated, 5) cameras be run by a trained student worker who works for the respective faculty member, and 6) students be encouraged to use new tapes.

Concerning random selection and screening, the committee suggested that: 1) a scientific random selection be used with an appropriate sample size, 2) telephoning procedures be monitored by committee members, 3) faculty evaluators meet to view

anchor speeches and review the assessment instrument before the screening, and 4) tapes be cued up to the beginning of the speech.

Concerning the assessment process, the committee suggested that: 1) the SCA "Competent Speaker Speech Performance Evaluation Form" be continued, 2) the goals of the basic speech course should conform to the areas of competency included in the SCA evaluation form, 3) following each assessment period, a report be prepared and distributed to the communication faculty, 4) a summary of the same report be distributed to any administrator's office concerned with assessment of the liberal arts and sciences core, and 5) faculty consider ways to incorporate the videotaping into class objectives (e.g. student self-assessment).

Implications

To date, the proposal and recommendations remain officially tabled. The pressures for oral communication assessment from the university administration, Missouri's Coordinating Board of Higher Education, and national accrediting agencies continue to mount.

In the mean time, several faculty members have decided to take a proactive assessment stance by revising and continuing to use the procedures outlined in the proposal. The proposal challenged the communication faculty with its first viable assessment program. Should the faculty decide to take another route, they will be able to build on the research invested in the prior effort. Should the faculty be pressed to implement assessment shortly, they must consider that a tested program exists and consider to what extent it should be altered.

Perhaps the more immediate implication of this proposal, has been the heuristic value. Given their familiarity with the issues and the literature, former assessment committee members have been able to raise questions, to theorize, to conduct significant

research. While this assessment proposal may not be the best assessment alternative for Northeast Missouri State University, it provides a workable model for beginning or refining assessment programs. From this perspective, the history of assessment efforts provides valuable insight.

Appendix A

SPEECH PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

SPEAKER'S NAME:_____ ASSIGNMENT:_____
EVALUATOR'S NAME: _____ DATE: __/__/___

EIGHT PUBLIC SPEAKING COMPETENCIES	SPEAKING PERFORMANCE RATINGS		
System for Scoring:	Unsatisfactory 1-3	Satisfactory 4-6	Excellent 7-9
Competency One CHOOSES AND NARROWS A TOPIC APPROPRIATELY FOR THE AUDIENCE AND OCCASION Comments:			
Competency Two COMMUNICATES THE THESIS/SPECIFIC PURPOSE IN A MANNER APPROPRIATE FOR AUDIENCE AND OCCASION Comments:			
Competency Three PROVIDES APPROPRIATE SUPPORTING MATERIAL BASED ON THE AUDIENCE AND OCCASION Comments:			
Competency Four USES AN ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN APPROPRIATE TO TOPIC, AUDIENCE, OCCASION, & PURPOSE Comments:			
Competency Five USES LANGUAGE THAT IS APPROPRIATE TO THE AUDIENCE AND OCCASION Comments:			
Competency Six USES VOCAL VARIETY IN RATE, PITCH, & INTENSITY, TO HEIGHTEN & MAINTAIN INTEREST Comments:			
Competency Seven USES PRONUNCIATION, GRAMMAR, & ARTICULATION APPROPRIATE TO THE DESIGNATED AUDIENCE Comments:			
Competency Eight USES PHYSICAL BEHAVIORS THAT SUPPORT THE VERBAL MESSAGE Comments:			

General Comments: Summative Score of Competencies:_____

Appendix B

Pilot Participant Questionnaire

Your frank responses are appreciated and will be considered for inclusion in our final report. Please return to Dr. Poyner at your earliest convenience.

1. I observed the following positive features of the pilot and its implementation.

2. I observed the following problems with the pilot and its implementation.

3. Did you use the videotapes for any other purpose than the pilot requirements? If yes, in what ways, and did you deem them as pedagogically beneficial?

4. Provided that the pilot will serve as a model for assessment at Northeast, what suggestions for improvement would you recommend?

Appendix C

TOTAL RATINGS GRID

Speakers	1				2				3				4				5				6				7			
Judges	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D
Competency 1	5	7	5	5	4	8	7	5	7	3	6	6	8	7	5	7	7	4	9	6	7	8	8	6	7	5	7	5
Competency 2	5	4	4		6	3	6	6	7	7	7	4	8	7	5	6	8	6	9	7	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	5
Competency 3	5	6	3	6	7	7	8	6	7	5	5	5	7	5	4	6	8	7	8	8	7	7	8	7	7	4	4	3
Competency 4	5	8	3	5	7	7	4	5	7	9	7	4	8	6	5	6	8	7	8	6	6	6	6	5	6	3	6	4
Competency 5	4	8	3	6	7	8	4	4	7	7	6	6	6	8	4	6	8	8	9	7	7	8	7	5	7	7	4	5
Competency 6	3	3	3	4	6	3	3	3	6	7	4	5	6	3	3	5	6	6	6	7	6	5	6	6	7	5	4	5
Competency 7	5	8	5	5	6	8	5	5	7	8	5	5	7	8	4	4	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	6	7	6
Competency 8	2	3	2	4	5	3	3	4	2	4	3	5	7	4	3	5	6	8	8	6	6	4	4	6	6	5	5	4